

## REMARKS

### INTRODUCTION

Claims 1-4, 7-11, 13, 14, 26-32, and 44-46 were previously and are currently pending and under consideration.

There are 21 claims pending, of which 4 are independent (claims 1, 13, 26, and 44).

Claims 1-4, 7-11, 13, 14, 26-32, and 44-46 stand rejected.

Claims 1, 13, and 26 amended herein.

No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection rejections is respectfully requested.

### INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the in-person Interview of May 8, 2008. At the Interview, Applicant and the Examiner discussed the outstanding rejection. Applicant presented the position that nothing in the specification indicates that the features deemed necessary by the Examiner are in fact necessary. Examiner noted that a companion case included similar language and therefore such language was desirable in the present application. Applicant agreed to make revisions to the claims to indicate what may occur when a compression type is not supported. However, Applicant does not agree with the current 112 rejection and notes for the record that nothing in the specification indicates that the claim additions made herein are necessary for operation of the inventions described by the claims. Nowhere does the specification indicate that it is necessary to return a response that the compression is not possible or supported. The rejection does not explain why this is deemed to be critical to the invention. As MPEP section 2164.08(c) states:

... an enablement rejection based on the grounds that a disclosed critical limitation is missing from a claim should be made only when the language of the specification makes it clear that the limitation is critical for the invention to function as intended. Broad language in the disclosure, including the abstract, omitting an allegedly critical feature, tends to rebut the argument of criticality.

However, to avoid additional communications, Applicant has amended claims 1, 13, and 26, in a manner which the Examiner agreed during the Interview would obviate concerns about the claims (concerns which are incorrectly expressed with a 112 rejection and which are not related to patentability).

With respect to the rejection of claim 44, Applicant notes that unamended claim 44 already recites "if the determining indicates that neither the printer nor the device driver is capable of decompressing the compressed the compressed data file, sending a message from the device driver to the application indicating that the data file cannot be decompressed, and in response the application uncompressing the compressed data file and sending the uncompressed data file to the printer via the device driver."

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

## **CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

Claim 1 stands objected to for various informalities, which are addressed by amendments to claim 1 that do not affect the scope or substance of the claim. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

The present application is in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is requested.

Should any fees be required in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

If the Examiner believes a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,  
Microsoft Corporation

Date: 19 May 2008

By: /James T. Strom/

James T. Strom, Reg. No.: 48,702  
Attorney for Applicants  
Direct telephone 425-939-0781